

HOMŒOPATHY :

3

WITH

PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO A LECTURE

BY

O. W. HOLMES, M. D.

By A. H. OKIE, M. D.

BOSTON :

OTIS CLAPP, SCHOOL STREET :

S. COLMAN AND WM. RADDE, NEW YORK ;

J. DOBSON AND J. G. WESSELHŒFT, PHILADELPHIA.

1842.

BOSTON,

FREEMAN AND BOLLES, PRINTERS,

WASHINGTON STREET.

P R E F A C E .

THE usual method adopted by practitioners of the old school, in order to explain the frequent cures, either real or apparent, which occur under the treatment of Homœopathists, is to adduce the influence of *imagination*, and to maintain that these cures are induced solely by this agency, and not from any positive curative power in medicaments prepared homœopathically and administered in infinitesimal doses. This argument is a prominent one, and is almost invariably made use of by our opponents. It has been offered by Dr. Holmes in his lectures, of which the following pages are a review. We neglected noticing this in the text; we shall therefore briefly consider it here, and attempt to show its fallacy. The following are our reasons for believing this argument unsound.

1st. Homœopathists have cured patients laboring under coma and apoplectic stupor.

2d. Infants, when diseased, are cured homœopathically.

3d. The diseases of the lower animals, as horses, cows, and sheep, have been treated with the greatest success upon the homœopathic principle.*

An individual laboring under coma, or apoplectic stupor from pressure on the brain, is in a situation in which it is impossible for him to exercise any of his mental faculties; of course the influence of imagination is here entirely without the pale of probability, and yet we have known patients in this alarming state rapidly and permanently relieved by the exhibition of an appropriate homœopathic remedy. The common sense of every individual will at once point out, that infants can have no knowledge of the rival systems of Homœopathy and Allopathy, or of any others. If, then, a little child recovers from an acute dis-

* A number of works on Veterinary Homœopathy have been published in Germany.

ease, as croup or scarlet fever, under any treatment whatsoever, is it philosophical, is it just, to ascribe such a recovery to the influence of the imagination?

Again; the lower animals have been subjected to homœopathic treatment, with the most brilliant results. We have personally witnessed the cure of several cases of Equine Phrenitis, commonly called *blind staggers*, a disease to which the horse is frequently subject. There is now in Philadelphia a veterinary establishment where horses are treated homœopathically. Its gentlemanly and intelligent proprietor has given us repeated opportunities of witnessing the astonishing effect of the homœopathic medication of animals. This we conceive to be one of the strongest evidences we can offer of the entire fallacy of the idea, that those patients only are cured homœopathically, whose imaginations are wrought upon by the homœopathic practitioner; for certainly it would require no little skill so to operate upon *the imagination of a horse*, as to cure him of a grave disease by this means.

If physicians of the old school have such implicit faith in the curative powers of the imagination, and of its influence as a therapeutic agent, why do not *they* cure diseases by its influence? In order to set this matter forever at rest, we invite them to institute the following simple experiments, which will certainly prove conclusive:

1st. Take an infant, laboring under croup or scarlet fever, give him a little sugar of milk, not medicated, or a few sugar globules; impress the parents, the friends, the attendants, and, *if possible*, the child itself, with the idea that he is under *homœopathic treatment*, and will certainly recover.

2d. Institute the same experiments on adults, laboring under pleurisy, quinsy, or tic douloureux.

After having performed these experiments repeatedly, and found them to prove successful in a majority of cases, *then* proclaim the influence of imagination and the nullity of Homœopathy as a positive system. But then, likewise, throw aside the lancet, the scarificator, and the leech; avoid the blister, the moxa, the seton; shun the cathartic, emetic, and the sudorific; cure your patients by *imagination*, and you will have arrived at the very acme of the art of healing.

HOMŒOPATHY.

IF we survey the history of past ages, and with it the rise and progress of discoveries in the various departments of science, we are struck with the uniform opposition to which everything assuming the name of a scientific discovery has been subjected. Nor is this strange, as a brief reference to some psychologic manifestations will demonstrate. The human mind seeks of necessity something to look up to, to love and to venerate ; yet there exists concomitantly in it a desire to cavil at, deprecate, or destroy, every thing which savors of departure from the monotony of routine to which men have all their lives been accustomed. The predominance of the first of these principles, of veneration, in the human mind, produces that purest of earthly acquirements, a true religious faith ; let this become ultra, and it sinks into fanaticism. On the other hand, the antagonistic principle, which serves to control and check the principle of veneration, preventing its degradation, is itself prone to deteriorate into a state, if possible, more calamitous than fanaticism — skepticism. These mental principles, however, do not expend all their force upon religious man, they are not confined strictly to theological science, and thus, though Theology shows us her martyrs, Natural Science and *Medicine* point to not a few, who, having dared to exercise freedom of thought upon scientific subjects, have felt the full force of the antagonistic principle of which we have been speaking, in the obloquy and rigor with which

their efforts have been rewarded. Those who have labored most zealously to instruct mankind, have been those who have suffered most from ignorance ; and the discoverers of new arts and sciences have hardly ever lived to see them accepted by the world. Before the times of Galileo and Harvey, the world believed in the stagnation of the blood, and the diurnal immovability of the earth ; and, for denying these, the one was persecuted and the other ridiculed.

In more modern times, Jenner, Arkwright and Windsor, and even our own countryman, Fulton, have been looked upon as visionaries, the inevitable fate of those who are in advance of the knowledge of their time. The founder of the Homœopathic system, Samuel Hahnemann, could not hope to escape the fate of his illustrious predecessors, and he has been for years an object on which invective and sarcasm have been lavished with no gentle hand, simply because he dared to show the medical world a path by which they might directly arrive at a point which has for centuries been the stumbling-block of the profession — a *knowledge of the specific properties of medical agents*. Specificity, speciality of purpose, or adaptability, is characteristic of Nature in all her operations, whether in the organic or inorganic world. The animal economy is a microcosm, in which many of the operations of nature are repeated. It may not be amiss to view cursorily some of these, as we thus arrive at a more definite appreciation of Nature's specificity.

Thus the eye, the organ of vision, has a specific agent — light, without which its power is null ; the ear has likewise its specific irritant — sound ; the gustatory nerve is acted upon only by sapid bodies, and taste is the result. In the botanical kingdom, each plant is impressed with particular characteristics, which enable the botanist to classify and give it specifications which differ from all others. Minerals we find to follow the same principles ; and the laws of crystallization present many beautiful examples of Nature's

unfailing, unerring specificity. Hahnemann, impressed with the force of a chain of reasoning such as we have detailed, has done nothing more than to inform the medical world that they have been pursuing a wrong course, in their treatise on *Materia Medica*. Impressed with the idea that Medicine, like her sister sciences, was not purely empirical, he has shown that the operation of remedies upon the animal economy is governed by a certain specific law,* which, by being fully comprehended and carried out, would enable physicians to treat diseases with far more certainty, and thus tend greatly to relieve the physical ills of suffering humanity. The law which he discovered, and called the Homœopathic law, derived from two Greek words signifying *similar disease*, was plainly this: Remedies cure diseases by the power they possess of exciting symptoms like the disease in individuals in health. This is well expressed by the Latin "*Similia similibus curantur*," which, since its connection with Homœopathic science, has become aphoristic.

This essay having particular reference to a lecture on "Homœopathy, and its kindred Delusions," by Dr. Holmes, we thought it well to state, thus plainly, the fundamental principle of the doctrine, in order that our readers may see the true point at issue, and observe how sedulously Dr. H. has avoided touching upon this, the only legitimate subject of argument, which, had he succeeded in overthrowing, must of course have carried with it the superstructure reared upon it. We will here remark, *en passant*, that these "Lectures" of Dr. H. would never have been publicly noticed by the present writer, if we had not deemed it our duty to remove, from the paths of those in search of truth, even the tiniest pebble which might obstruct their course. We shall attempt to show, that, despite assertions like the

* We have not alluded to the particulars which led to the discovery of this law, and which have been so often repeated; they may be met with, however, in any of the numerous *brochures* which have been published.

following, "Not one statement shall be made which cannot be supported by unimpeachable reference" — "I have no quibbles to utter, and I stoop to answer none," he has not reviewed the subject fairly; that his rationale of phenomena is erroneous; that he has merged his philosophy in his wit; and that Homœopathy, so far from being injured, is absolutely benefited by assaults like this, as they serve to manifest the nullity of all argument which is brought in opposition to it.

The first question which would naturally arise in discussing a particular doctrine, would be, whether the individual engaged in the discussion had submitted the doctrines in question to the "*test of practice.*" Aware of this, our author says, "'The question may be asked in the outset, Have you submitted the doctrines you are professing to examine, to the test of long-repeated and careful experiment? have you *tried* to see whether they were true or not?" He excuses himself, for *not* having tested the system practically, in the following droll manner: "Besides, as arguments in favor of Homœopathy have frequently been addressed to the public by inexperienced *dilletanti*, the same channel is open to all its opponents." In plainer language, many persons, having written in favor of Homœopathy without understanding it, I, a *medical man*, intend to enlighten the world upon a subject, of which I am totally ignorant practically. Truly an admirable justification, and one that, at the sick-bed of a suffering patient, would be unanswerable. It reminds us of one Gemelli Carreri, a Neapolitan gentleman, who for many years never quitted his chamber, confined by a tedious indisposition; he amused himself with writing a voyage round the world, giving characters of men and descriptions of countries which he had never visited. The only indisposition which affects our author is the predominance of the antagonistic principle in his mind, preventing him pursuing the only path which leads to truth — that of *induction*. On page 30, he informs us, "A disease for Hahnemann consists essentially in a group of symptoms." We would fain

inquire, in what a disease *for* Dr. Holmes consists? as he has shed no genial ray of light upon this point. And as he sneers at Hahnemann's idea of disease being of dynamic origin, we are led to infer, that he is one of that class to whom the following is applicable: "There are minds who seek everywhere after the grossest and most material causes, even if these causes have to be dragged in by the hair of the head, merely in order not to admit the validity of any dynamic and invisible causes, however simple they may appear."* Hahnemann's views of disease are, that it is of dynamic origin, that is, the production of some internal change, of which the senses cannot take cognizance save by its effects. In other words, disease is manifested solely by its symptoms, which, however, Hahnemann does not divide into "Groups," but considers it essential to the proper understanding of their relative and collective value, that they should be treated in their *ensemble* or totality, and that remedy is most strictly adapted to any given case, homœopathically, which elicits in healthy individuals symptoms most closely resembling the totality of symptoms of disease. Thus, to draw a simple comparison, ipecacuanha taken by a person in health, produces nausea and vomiting. Should these symptoms suddenly appear spontaneously, without any others which might indicate another remedy, the Homœopathist would administer a minute dose of ipecac, on the homœopathic law, that medicines are impressed with the power of overcoming diseases, upon the principle that no two similar actions can exist in the same part concomitantly. And as Nature has given the power to the medicinal action of overcoming the morbid, the disease is cured; and Homœopathy is nothing more or less than an attempt to prove the truth of this natural curative law.

Dr. Holmes, in the pages of his work immediately succeeding, gives the homœopathic mode of preparing of vari-

* Menzel.

ous medicaments ; he seems particularly struck with the idea, that Hahnemann should prefer the friable part of an oyster shell, which is a pure carbonate of lime, to common chalk, which is an impure carbonate, in experimenting with that article. The Doctor seems to think it an extremely strange thing, that carbonate of lime, in an infinitely minute dose, should be capable of producing any appreciable effect upon the animal economy. And, influenced by such feelings, he attempts to *ridicule* what, as a medical man, he should seek to *investigate*, recollecting that “ real philosophy seeks rather to solve than to deny.” We will catechise him briefly on some few points, and if, by philosophical and just answers to our questions, he convinces us that he can explain phenomena which are of daily occurrence ; that to us are much more strange than that carbonate of lime, in accordance with a natural law, should, in an infinitesimal dose, overcome symptoms to which it is homœopathically adapted, we will be willing to renounce Homœopathy as a fallacy, and take to giving our patients *creta preparata*, or *prepared chalk*, in the doses recommended by the Solons who have written upon *Materia Medica*, who look upon chalk as they do upon cheese, as something to be swallowed.

Why should the atmosphere surrounding a person sick with small pox contain a poison capable of infecting a healthy man with the same disease ; and this poison, undoubtedly of a physical nature, because physical agents are capable of destroying it ? What portion in weight is there of this penetrating virus ? What is its bulk ? Can you see it, taste it, weigh it ? Is it appreciable to any of our senses ? Have not the best of our eudiometrists, after the most thorough analysis, failed to discover any matter or substance whatever, to distinguish such a poisonous atmosphere from the common air ? How, then, do we know it does differ ? — solely from its *effects*. And thus it is with the infinitesimal doses of homœopathy, we know them by their *effects*. Medical philosophers have, like metaphysi-

cians, searched too long and with too great a loss to humanity, after causes; the Homœopath in a disease recognises only its manifestations by its *symptoms*; in Therapeutics he is guided by the sole and unerring principle of effects. "The same poison exists in the purulent matter of the variculous pustule of which the millionth part of a grain (or perhaps the millionth part of that) may produce the disease. It is therefore the *infinitely minute quantity of the agent present in the air*, that prevents its detection by chemical analysis. And hence the impossibility of physically detecting aerial poisons. But the poison of small pox we know exists concentrated in the pustule; the matter of which, carefully analyzed, leaves us as much in the dark as ever. We have it, but cannot make it evident to our senses. There is nothing there which our agencies can distinguish as differing from the matter of any other, the simp'lest pustule. Assuredly Nature has her secrets, which she designs man shall never master." *

Again we may refer to the influence exerted by marshy exhalations, or malaria in the production of the most grave diseases, yet this agent, capable of producing a violent fever throughout whole districts of country, is just as subtile as the virus of small pox, and has never yet been detected by the most careful analysis. Would it not be folly to shut our eyes to facts like these, which so conclusively prove that in the *production* of diseases, the agents which nature employs are never distinguished for their mere weight or bulk? Indeed, so minute, so *infinitesimal* are they, that they escape all our efforts to discover what they really are. It is their *effects* alone that we appreciate. We can likewise refer to magnetism, electricity and galvanism, other natural agents, which, like the infinitesimal doses, are known solely by their effects. And also to the effects of minute doses of common remedies producing diseases. Nay, farther, the mere inhalation and olfaction of substances giving rise to the

* Dr. Bird's Address.

most grave affections ; take for instance, the following from Dr. Benjamin Rush, whose name, we think even Dr. H. has heard. “ *Certain odors* produce insanity. There is a place in Scotland where madness is sometimes induced by the fumes of lead. Patients who are afflicted with it bite their hands and tear their flesh upon the other parts of their bodies. It is called by the country people *millreck*. Dr. Prost describes a furious grade of madness in Peru brought on by a mineral exhalation, but he does not mention the mineral from which it is derived. From among many other facts that might be mentioned to show the connection of odors with a morbid state of the mind, I shall mention one more. An ingenious dyer, of this city, informed me that he often observed the men who were employed in dying blue, of which color indigo is the basis, to become peevish and low-spirited, and never even to hum a tune while engaged at their work.”

And again, by referring to Dr. Chapman’s work on Therapeutics, we learn that ipecacuanha has been found an admirable remedy in asthma, and in a note annexed, we find that the inhalation of the dust of ipecac produces asthma : does not this look very much like the operation of the natural therapeutic laws, “like cures like ?” These instances might be carried to almost any extent, but we have preferred giving a few from well-known American writers, which any one may consult, if he sees proper. To prove the truth and fidelity of the experiments made by homœopathists with these substances, indigo and ipecac, we refer Dr. Holmes to page 285 of Jahr’s manual, in which he will find among the moral symptoms of indigo, “ill disposed and indolent humor,” thus confirming the truth of Dr. Rush’s observation ; and to 294 of the same work, article ipecacuanha, where he will find, “anxious and short respiration ; spasmodic asthma, with contraction of the larynx, and panting respiration ; sighing respiration ; oppression of the chest and shortness of breath, as if caused by having inhaled dust.” This is a pretty plain picture of

some varieties of asthma, and it is just this kind of asthma ipecac cures. When will physicians learn, that before they can administer remedies understandingly, they must be acquainted with their true effects, as manifested by the various changes they are capable of producing in the healthy human body? Magendie, the French physiologist, has made many experiments with medical agents upon the lower animals, and has described the various changes of structure, &c., which they produce; he has deserved, and received a full meed of praise; but Hahnemann, who has chosen to experiment upon the noblest of God's creatures, man; has offered himself as a subject, and has written down with the utmost minuteness every change in sensation, however apparently trivial; who has taken cognizance of all moral changes with the most scrupulous exactness, is derided and laughed at by individuals too bigoted, or too unphilosophical to see the immense advantage which he was conferring on the present generation and on posterity. Well might the venerable sage exclaim with Bacon: "For my name and memory, I leave it to men's charitable speeches, and to foreign nations and the next ages." There are various moral causes acting upon man which produce disease, and these same moral agencies likewise overcome disease, when the impression they excite is similar; in other words, — homœopathic to the existing state. Take the following instances:*

"The theatre has often been resorted to, to remove fits of low spirits, and it is a singular fact, that a *tragedy* oftener dissipates them than a comedy. The remedy, though distressing to persons with healthy minds, is like the temperature of cold water to persons benumbed with frost: it is exactly proportioned to the excitability of their minds, and

* It may be observed, that most of our comparisons are taken from works of practitioners of the old school, and from American authors who are well known. We do so purposely, in order that our readers may have an opportunity of consulting authorities which are easy of access, and which contain a host of observations confirmatory of Homœopathy.

it not only abstracts their attention from themselves, but revives their spirits." "A female patient of mine, in whom this disease (melancholy) had several times been excited by family afflictions, lost a favorite child, in November, 1811, which produced many of its symptoms. Soon afterwards, her husband became sick. The lighter and *dissimilar* distress occasioned by this event suddenly removed her disease, and she regained, with the recovery of her husband, her usual health and spirits. Mirth, or even cheerfulness, when employed as remedies to low spirits, are like hot water to a frozen limb." The above extracts from the celebrated work of Dr. Benjamin Rush, on diseases of the mind, are apt illustrations of the Homœopathic law. And although that eminent physician has erred in his rationale of one case cited, by calling the distress *dissimilar*, yet it must be evident to every one whose attention is directed to the subject, that the distress occasioned proved curative homœopathically.

Dr. Holmes next proceeds to state the Psoric doctrine of Hahnemann, and endeavors to impress his audience with the idea, that that great man has informed the world that the *itch* was the cause of seven-eighths of all chronic diseases. Now *Psora*, in the Hahnemannian acceptation of the term, does not have particular reference to the itch alone. He comprises, under the term *Psora*, all of the infinite varieties of cutaneous eruptions, and maintains that the suppression of these by external remedies is a prolific source of disease. And in this he does not stand alone, for we find the celebrated Bichat says, "The innumerable phenomena which arise from the disappearance of herpes, the itch, &c., imprudently produced: in all these cases it does not appear that morbid matter is carried to the other organs, though I do not pretend that this never happens. It is the vital forces of these which are raised, and which then occasion different accidents: now, as these forces vary in each system, those accidents will be essentially different; thus the same morbid cause disappearing from

the skin will produce vomiting, if thrown upon the stomach, in which the sensible organic contractility predominates; pains if it goes to the nerves, which are especially characterized by animal sensibility; derangement of sight, hearing, and smell, if it affects the various nerves of these senses. Hemorrhage, catarrhs, phthisis, tubercles, inflammations, &c., if it attack the mucous surfaces, the lungs, the serous membranes, &c., in all of which the organic sensibility is raised."

Dr. U. Parsons, of Providence, R. I., from whose "Dissertation on the connection between cutaneous diseases, which are not contagious, and the internal organs," the above is extracted, relates several cases in which a manifest relationship existed between eruptions on the surface of the skin and internal disorders following their disappearance. Dr. Rush, in the work already referred to, says, "I have known of two instances of this disease, (insanity) in which a recovery succeeded *an attack of the itch*." Almost all medical men with whom we have had an opportunity of conversing on this subject, have informed us, that since their attention has been directed to this point by Hahnemann's labors, they have had repeated opportunities of proving the justness of the view, that an immense number of chronic diseases do arise from suppressed or latent eruptions, which Hahnemann has classed under the general name of Psora. We are almost tempted to add, that Dr. Holmes himself presents a striking instance of the all-pervading influence of Psora, as the *itch* for authorship has evidently led him to make public a mass of unphilosophical crudities, of which, we doubt not, he will sooner or later feel not a little ashamed.

On page 33, in speaking of the principles of Homœopathy, Dr. Holmes remarks, "In general, the Homœopapist calls every recovery which happens under his treatment a *cure*." Well, we cannot see anything so strange in this, and we shall show, when a little more advanced, that many recoveries which occur under homœopathic treatment

some allopathists call, *allopathic cures*. "A large number of substances, commonly thought to be inert, develop great medicinal powers, when prepared in the manner already described," that is, by trituration. The truth or fallacy of this can only be determined by experiment, and as Dr. Holmes has informed us that he has made no experiments, he is consequently incapable of giving an opinion any more than an individual could, *a priori*, affirm that the mere *rubbing* of glass, or amber, would develop electrical phenomena, or the contact of copper and zinc elicit galvanism. No one pretends now to doubt these facts, because every one has witnessed them; but until the experiments of Galvani accidentally called forth, had directed attention to this subject, no one had ever supposed the existence of such a power as Galvanism. In the same manner with the trituration of homœopathic remedies, Hahnemann has demonstrated that many articles which are comparatively inert in their natural state, as common salt, silex and charcoal, when triturated for a sufficient length of time, become possessed of powerful medical virtues. This, it will be seen, is a matter which is to be proved or disproved experimentally, and all argument, which is not based upon experiments, accurately conducted, is as idle as the wind.

"Diseases should be recognised, as far as possible, not by any of the common names imposed upon them, as fever or epilepsy, but as individual collections of symptoms, each of which differs from any other collection." One of the greatest merits of Hahnemann is the independence he has exhibited in cutting himself loose from the crazy car of Nosology. Physicians have been content too long, to look upon *names* as *things*, names which too often enshroud the bright truths of which they should be the representatives. Survey all the learned names which Nosology parades in formidable array before us, and see if they bring a single advantage to practical medicine. How true are the words of Faust here applied, "name is but sound and vapor enshrouding heaven's glow." Individualization is another prominent feature in Homœopathy; for as the effects of every plant, every salt,

acid, earth or mineral, on the human body are peculiar, so the manifestations of every disease are modified more or less by individual peculiarities, as age, sex, temperament, &c. Compare this with the generalities of the old school, who, although she pretends to have the highest respect for the collateral branches, as botany, mineralogy, &c., really derives but little practical benefit from them, and, were it not necessary for her practitioners to arrogate the seeming of science, they would soon be dropt altogether. "The symptoms of any complaint must be described with the most minute exactness, and, as far as possible, in the patient's own words." Indeed, they must, for who so capable of giving an accurate description of his feelings and sensations, as the poor sufferer himself? And although Nosology will force names upon us, she cannot certainly expect that we should put words into our patients' mouths with which to describe their ills.

We shall not attempt to point out the entire inaptness of the comparison which Dr. H. endeavors to institute between Homœopathy and Perkinism : they resemble each other in no one particular. There are so many other incongruous and unphilosophical comparisons in the Doctor's lecture claiming our attention, which have at least more the appearance of justice, that we shall barely allude to the following. Perkinism was instituted in 1796, and died in 1811. Homœopathy was first made public by Hahnemann, in 1796, in the world-renowned Hufeland's Journal. It is therefore, nearly half a century old ! It has lived to see the downfall of Cullen's vagaries, Brown's fancies, and Broussais' dogmas. It however has continued to increase slowly but surely, daily adding to the number of its advocates, both lay and professional. The theories of the eminent medical gentlemen we have mentioned, were fungoid excrescences, growing from the rotten stump of allopathy, parasites which have fallen off, leaving their aged parent to be torn out by the roots, to be replaced by a young and vigorous sapling, a tree of promise.

Dr. H. tells us, on page 36, that, "the three great asserted discoveries of Hahnemann, are entirely unconnected and independent of each other. Were there any natural relation between them, it would seem probable enough that the discovery of one would have led to that of the others. But assuming that diseases are cured by remedies capable of producing symptoms like their own, no manifest relation exists between this fact and the next assertion, namely, the power of the infinitesimal doses." Any one at all acquainted with the operation of Homœopathic medicines, will see the fallacy of this observation. Hahnemann, in his first applications of remedies to disease on the newly discovered principle, administered them in the doses prescribed by the old school. He soon found, however, that in consequence of the aggravation produced in the disease from the very fact of the *homœopathicity* of his remedies, that he would be obliged to diminish his doses; he did so, and in experimenting upon this subject, we find the same acuteness of observation, and knowledge of the true principles of induction that always characterized him. He did not *at once* diminish his doses to their present degree of minuteness, but by a gradual series of experiments he endeavored to find out the dose that would prove most quickly *curative* with the least possible degree of suffering to his patient. In this he presents a striking difference to many of his allopathic compeers, whose object it appears to be, not to see how *little* medicine will prove curative, but to see how *much* the constitution of the patient will bear.

Thus cases are related in a Southern Medical Journal, where patients laboring under "the fever," were dosed with calomel *by the teaspoonful*, and bled in proportion. And this treatment, in medical language, is termed "heroic;" but what *heroism* there is in administering to a pale sufferer a dose of medicine, in vulgar language, "big enough to kill a horse," passeth our poor understanding. On page 37, Dr. H. says, "there is a degree of plausibility in the state-

ment," that is, that diseases "yield to remedies capable of producing like symptoms." Here is quite an admission. We are almost led to exclaim, with the Doctor's *Perkinised patient*, "Well, to be sure, the longer one lives, the more one sees," to hear him state there is a degree of *plausibility* in homœopathy. Shade of good old Domine Sampson, assist us in giving vent to an excessive *Pro-di-gi-ous*.

Let us see, after this bombast, whether the knowledge of effects of remedies which they administer in disease, are so familiar to practitioners of the old school as to permit the Doctor, without arrogance, to indulge in such language. We shall quote the opinions of some of the most eminent writers of the old practice, with whom, however, of course Dr. H. is not familiar, or he would not have ventured, in the face of such glaring inaccuracies on the part of his Allopathic brethren, to have pronounced such sweeping denunciations against "the sole law of nature in therapeutics." "Examine the conflicting testimony—the testimony of distinguished pharmacologists in relation to *narcotin*.* According to Derosne, it is a simple narcotic: according to Magendie, a stimulant narcotic: according to professor O'Shaughnessy, it is neither stimulant nor narcotic, but powerfully sudorific and anti-periodic: and, according to Bally and Orfila, *it has no properties at all*. The first accounts of the sensible operative of *Iodine* were equally contradictory. It was an emetic, a cathartic, a diuretic, a sialogue, an inebriating stimulant, a stomachic, a gastric corrosive, an hæmorrhagic: it was, in fact every thing; and it was—*nothing*: for some practitioners assert that they succeeded in administering immense doses of it in every active form, without any effects appearing to follow.

These extracts serve to show the vagueness of the knowledge of practitioners, even men the most eminent in their profession, of the true effects of remedies. What are you to expect then from the mass of the profession? Men not

* Dr. Bird's Oration, p. 19.

imbued with the knowledge which distinguish their masters. Any one may see from this that unless physicians really make themselves acquainted with the science of Pathogenesis, they can never hope to attain any thing like favorable results in their practice. Had the eminent gentlemen referred to, been content to adopt the inductive principle which Hahnemann has introduced into medicine — had they striven to discover what the true effects of iodine were *before* administering it in disease, we would not have found them contradicting each other, and covering themselves and the whole profession with ridicule ; they would have found “ that all were right, and all were wrong,” for by turning to the Mat. Med. of Hahnemann, we have a solution of all these difficulties ; we find that iodine produces vomiting, purgation, produces weakness of the digestive organs, copious discharge of urine, discharges of blood from the bowels, uterus, and organs of respiration. In short, that the *collective* names of which each practitioner was anxious to bring out under a particular head, according to his own observations, give a tolerably correct general picture of some of the chief effects of this substance — yet these are entirely too vague for practical purposes, we must be acquainted with its more minute effects ; for if iodine vomits, so does ipecac, and you certainly will not give iodine and ipecac under the same circumstances. It becomes therefore necessary to be acquainted with *all* of the properties of a medical agent, before its therapeutic application can be at all determined ; and who has yet proposed a more philosophic or practical mode of acquiring this knowledge than Hahnemann ? The burden of the answer to this query falls on the Allopathists, and to them we leave it.

Dr. Holmes, *after* Dr. Pavini, appears before us on page 38 of his book, in the character of a mathematician, and would fain make his readers believe that more alcohol is required to prepare a homœopathic medicament to the seventeenth dilution, than would “ equal in quantity the waters of ten thousand Adriatic seas.” Now, at the risk of being

thought impertinent, we will assure our readers that it requires just about *three ounces* of alcohol to prepare a homœopathic remedy to the seventeenth dilution in the mode recommended by Hahnemann. Dr. Holmes's, or rather Dr. Pavini's method, may require the quantity specified, or may not; that is all the same to us, as we are not such ultra te-totallers as to require our "drop" to be diluted to such an excess, being perfectly satisfied with the *effects* of the remedies prepared according to Hahnemann. We may remark, however, that nothing is easier than to build up *ideal* modes of doing any thing, however plain, and then adduce arguments to knock them down again. This plan has been adopted by Pavini, and his imitator, Dr. H.

Dr. Holmes, in commenting upon Pavini's *original* method of preparing homœopathic remedies by diluting them with "Adriatic seas" of alcohol, asks, "Is there not in this as great an exception to all hitherto received laws of nature as the miracle of the loaves and fishes?" Ask this question of a Homœopathist, and he will answer by referring to the effects produced by a very minute portion of vaccine matter, or the extraordinary diffusion of odors; but the vaccine matter is one of those substances called *morbid poisons*, of which it is a peculiar character to multiply themselves when introduced into the system, as a seed does in the soil. Therefore the hundredth part of a grain of the vaccine matter, if no more than this is employed, soon increases in quantity, until in the course of about a week it is a grain or more, and can be collected in considerable drops. And what is a very curious illustration of Homœopathy, it never produces symptoms of any consequence until it is already in sufficient quantity not merely to be visible, but to be collected for further use." If Dr. Holmes supposes he has overcome the difficulty by calling the vaccine virus a *morbid poison*, he is greatly at fault, for we have already shown, that although there may be a grain or more, or even "considerable drops," that this purulent matter is merely the *vehicle*; that although you see the pustule, the matter of

which does not differ from any other in appearance, or when analyzed, though you may destroy its specific virulency by certain agents, still the *infinitely minute quantity*, of what is truly its essence defies detection; and yet this infinitely minute quantity, which "never produces symptoms of any consequence," is all-sufficient to protect the system from a loathsome disease, solely because it is homœopathic. If the mere fact of its being a *morbid poison* were a sufficient solution we might inform Dr. Holmes of a fact of which he appears to be ignorant, that there are various other morbid poisons besides the vaccine virus, and we would inquire why some other morbid poison than this virus is not employed as a preventive to small pox! The reason is obviously because no other substance that we are yet acquainted with, possesses the specific prophylactic powers of this, and simply because no other substance *produces effects so much like small pox*, in individuals in health.

We pass over the farrago of nonsense, unworthy more than a passing notice, in which the prevailing characteristic is the *ideal*, and of which the following is a specimen. "But if a man comes to me with a pestle and mortar in his hand, and tells me that he will take a little speck of some substance which nobody ever thought to have any smell at all, as, for instance, a grain of chalk, or charcoal, and that he will, after an hour or two rubbing and scraping, develop an odor which shall be capable of pervading a whole apartment, a house, a village, a province, an empire, nay, the entire atmosphere of the broad planet on which we tread," &c. We have extracted the above to show the tendency there is in the human mind to run into extremes. Any one may see at a glance that this nonsense is about as applicable to Homœopathy as the late celebrated moon hoax is to the solution of some problem in political economy. We are strongly inclined to question the Doctor's profound knowledge of the subject on which he was lecturing. He was certainly laboring under a *delusion* when the above was penned. The ideas he has absorbed seem more like those

of some bedlamite poet, than a sober-minded Doctor, devoted to the interest of his profession. In speaking of the *Materia Medica* of Hahnemann, the mode which Dr. Holmes adopts is extremely ungenerous. He selects two isolated symptoms, without any regard to their connection, which is of course productive of apparent incongruities. A comparison, not inapt, is found in the cross-readings with which the columns of our newspapers are frequently garnished. Suppose the philosophic writings of Franklin and Jefferson, or the muse of Milton and Shakspeare were subjected to such unfair criticism. We can readily conceive how they might be made to appear excessively ridiculous. Great, however, would be the reaction in the minds of those who should subsequently read the writings of these great Poets and Philosophers in their ungarbled purity. And thus with Hahnemann's *Materia Medica*. An individual, who had been made acquainted with it solely through the distorted media of critics like Dr. Holmes, would feel a flush akin to anger on his cheek when he becomes practically acquainted with it, and by daily experiences witnesses the faithfulness of the recorded symptoms. There may be inaccuracies, as "to err is human," but these are not *productive of the same injury to patients*, that the glaring inaccuracies, the gross and palpable absurdities of the old *Materia Medica* are.

Dr. Holmes objects that *healthy* individuals, who have experimented with homœopathic remedies, should have written down and stated, as proceeding from their effects, all the minute changes, moral and physical, which occurred while under their influence. If this be really a valid objection to homœopathic experiments and the homœopathist's mode of obtaining knowledge of the effects of drugs, how much more powerful are the objections which may be urged against the old school practitioners, who administer remedies without any previous knowledge of their effects, *for the first time in disease*. If a man in health cannot tell correctly what effect a remedy has upon him, what are you to expect from a sick person? When the disease itself, by some of

the numerous sympathies of the animal economy, may give rise to symptoms which may be ascribed to the remedy, or the reverse. Besides, after a full trial of a remedy upon healthy individuals, the Homœopathists may *then*, with a knowledge of its effects, test the truth or fallacy of particular symptoms by observing whether the remedy removes *morbid symptoms* like its own. This is an unerring guide. In concluding this part of our subject we would inquire of our readers whether they would suppose that physician best acquainted with the effects of a certain remedy, who had upon his own person tried the drug in question, and who, in order to be as accurate as possible, had attributed a trivial sensation to its influence which might have occurred otherwise, (for sensations of a more grave character, of course, there can be no dispute about,) or one who administers a remedy for the first time in disease, because he has heard, or if you please, because some great man has written that it was good for this thing or the other thing. He gives his remedy, and his patient vomits. This new substance is an emetic, says the Doctor, and must be classed with ipecac and antimony. Stop! says a second Doctor; I gave that medicine to a patient of mine, and it purged him; I maintain it is a cathartic, and ranks with rhubarb and senna. Come! come! says a third; you neither of you know any thing about it; it's a sialagouge, for I exhibited it, and it salivated my patient like mercury.

“ I've seen it, friend, as well as you,
And must again affirm it's blue.
'Tis green, 'tis green, I can assure ye.
'Green,' cries the other in a fury!”

Now any unprejudiced mind may judge which, *a priori*, presents the greatest semblance of scientific investigation, and the proper mode of obtaining a knowledge of the true effects of medical agents. The science of Pathogenesis, — Homœopathy, or the science which speculates upon what the effects of drugs ought to be, — Allopathy.

The large doses of remedies which practitioners of the old school are accustomed to exhibit, is likewise a prolific source of error. We are all familiar with the effects of eating too much food, or drinking too large a quantity of water; the offended organ revolts at repletion, and vomiting is produced. Thus with large doses of medicaments; take mercury in the form of calomel as an instance; ten grains of this substance will produce purgation. If the Allopathist is anxious to produce other than its purgative effect, he divides the ten grains into five or six doses, and see! an alterative effect is produced. His patient is not purged, this quantity has not produced a sufficient effect to excite catharsis. What does result then? The gums of the patient become swollen and spongy, the salivary glands are stimulated, his breath exhales a fetid odor, termed technically *mercurial fetor*. Let this salivation be kept up for some time, which is frequently done in the allopathic treatment of diseases, and new phenomena become manifest. Ulcers in the throat, pains in the shafts of the long bones occur, which are aggravated at night, the patient grows weak, has night sweats, a hectic appearance, his hair falls out, &c. These are, then, the true symptoms of mercury when its use is persisted in for a length of time *in divided doses*. How different this from the purgative effects following the administration of a large dose by which the natural emunctories are called into action, and overburdened nature makes an effort to throw off the foreign substance. This is the reason why Homœopathists, in experimenting with drugs, divide their doses minutely, as it is by such means alone that we arrive at a knowledge of the true effects of medical agents.

Our author next cites the experiments of Andral to prove the nothingness of homœopathy. The experiments of M. Andral have been proved to be vague and unsatisfactory. The very fact of his being the eminent Allopathist that he is, and the leader of a medical clique at Paris, on which Dr. Holmes insists so strenuously, is in itself an argument against his conducting experiments fairly. We maintain,

that if M. Andral had been entirely free from prejudice, and had not had his attention distracted by a thousand other pursuits, if his *whole time* during one year (the period affixed to the purported trials) had been devoted solely to Homœopathic experiments, he could not have given decisive proof of the truth or fallacy of Homœopathy. The field of Therapeutics is too extensive for one man in so short a time to set a question of such immense importance entirely at rest. We have already shown the discrepancies of Baille, Orfila, Magendie, &c., men as celebrated as Andral in regard to *one substance*. How, then, should M. Andral be enabled to pronounce positive sentence on Homœopathy, which should amount to a *fiat* when it involves the effects of over two hundred remedies. We are able, however, to give decisive proof as to the experiments of M. Andral. The following statement from the work of Dr. Curie, who, according to Dr. Holmes, "Dr. Baille declares to be an enlightened man, and perfectly sincere in his convictions." As this opinion comes from an opponent, he is certainly to be considered a credible witness.

REMARKS AS TO DR. ANDRAL.

BY. DR. CURIE.

To Dr. Andral, it is quite impossible to make any specific, precise, and critical reply, because no homœopathists witnessed the numerous experiments which he states himself to have made; but, as he consulted no one on the proper manner of making them, we think it may, at first sight, be fairly presumed, that he was not acquainted with the specific medicine for each case, nor with the precise and essential condition on which success depended. This will speedily receive confirmation.

A short time, indeed, previous to the discussion of Homœopathy by the Académie de Medicine, Dr. Andral mentioned, in course of conversation with the author of this

work, that, although he had directed his attention to the subject, his mind was not made up as to its merits, and frankly avowed that he knew very little about the practice involved in the new doctrines. How, then, could M. Andral, who acknowledged that he had scarcely acquired the elements of homœopathic practice, venture to pronounce sentence on these doctrines? What opinion would be formed of a jury, which should condemn, before it made itself acquainted with the facts of the case? Yet such, precisely, was M. Andral's position.

"But there is a fact to be stated here, which is perfectly decisive as to M. Andral: *he had absolutely no guide in the prescription of homœopathic medicines, and he made a wrong application of every medicine employed*, as has been clearly shown in the "Archives de la Medicine Homœopathique," Tome Premier, No. 1, for July, 1834. No comment nor detail can add force to this decisive fact."

If Dr. Holmes had really been anxious to give his audience a veritable account of the experiments of M. Andral, we think he would have been solicitous at least to have mentioned the counter statement of the affair, contained in the "Archive de la Medicine Homœopathique," especially as he informs us, that he was in the habit of receiving that journal. He however makes no mention of this, but leaves his audience to suppose that the statement he gives was, verbatim, true, and had never been denied. This looks very much like an attempt, on the Doctor's part, to throw dust in the eyes of his audience, and places him in the unpleasant position either of not being aware of all the facts, or of an attempt at concealment, both equally culpable in a lecturer, who assured his audience, at the commencement of his discourse, that he was about to give a fair account of Homœopathy.

Dr. Holmes assumes the position that the unprofessional portion of the community are unable to judge of the truth or fallacy of medical theories. He instances Perkinism and Tar Water to prove how little the views of the laity are

to be relied upon on medical subjects ; but if the mere fact of the public having been deceived into giving evidence with respect to particular modes of treatment, and which modes have been subsequently proved to be false, is all that can be adduced to support this position, then the *medical profession* itself stands in the same predicament, for it should be borne in mind that the whole, or a great portion of the profession have at times been wedded to particular theories and modes of treatment, which have subsequently been exploded. Thus, in ancient times, the humoralists held full sway, and they in their turn made way for the solidists. We have had the theories of Cullen, of Brown, of Darwin, of Broussais, each of which have either carried the profession with them, *en masse*, or have had many adherents, and have, nevertheless, ceased to be considered rational theories in medicine. The views of the philosophic Menzel, we think, are for the most part just, and we therefore quote them.

“ Hahnemann has brought about an astonishing revolution in medicine. We stand in the same position towards the Physicians as in the time of the Reformation towards the Priests. Then innovators in religion were opposed to the priestly hierarchy, and had to appeal to sound common sense, as well as to the interest of the laity, in order to gain the support of the laity, and to conquer with them. Innovators in medicine are now opposed to the hierarchy of doctors ; and they, too, appeal to the understanding and the interest of the laity for support and protection to the good cause. Is our understanding less qualified to try the medical controversy than formerly the theological ? We shall see. Are we less interested in it ? Surely not. Every blow which the medical parties strike each other falls back at last upon us, the patients ; and every thing good which they discover turns finally to our advantage. Methinks this gives us a very good right to inform ourselves upon the principles according to which the physicians treat us ; and it might sometimes be useful to remind them *that they are made for the sick, not the sick for them* ; for it has really

often seemed as if the physicians imagined the latter. If the nations have maintained their interests against secular despotism, by constitutions and the freedom of the press, why, in the name of common sense, should physicians enjoy the privilege of slaughtering us without being called to account for it? The Homœopathists take their stand as reformers, and declare to us that the physicians, with their hitherto prevailing allopathic method, have levied contributions upon us, without having helped us, just as the priests did with the sale of indulgences; they propose to us an extremely simple and universally intelligible medical theory, are angry at, and complain of the blind rage of the predominant medical caste, which proclaims them heretics, and turn to us the people for protection against them. At the same time, a multitude of laymen come forward, who set up for champions for Homœopathy, as formerly Hutten and Sickengen set up for champions of Lutheranism, because they consider themselves happy in having been speedily healed by homœopathic cures of inveterate diseases, and hold it to be their most sacred duty to make all their suffering contemporaries participators of the like bliss. These are the facts. Should we, the laity, not give a hearing to such urgent demands? What would have become of the Reformation had not the laity taken part in it — if they had been frightened into thinking that theological controversies extended beyond their horizon, and must be left to the theologians alone? In that case, Luther would have been burnt at the stake.”

We think Dr. Holmes speaks very disrespectfully of the Patriarchs of his profession, and exhibits not a little spleen that Hahnemann should have been able to demonstrate, from the most celebrated authors, ancient and modern, men the most astute in medical literature, the truth of the fundamental principle of his doctrine. Before quoting his numerous authorities, Hahnemann remarks, “Until the present time, no person has ever inculcated this homœopathic mode of treatment, and yet more, no one has ever put it

into practice. But if this is the only true method, (of which every one may be convinced with myself,) we ought to discover sensible traces of it in every epoch of the art, although its true character may have been unknown during thousands of years. And such in reality has been the case." In accordance with this, he quotes between two and three hundred authorities, among them the most celebrated names that ever wielded pen in medical behalf. Dr. Holmes very disingenuously states, that "a large majority of the names of old authors which Hahnemann cites, are entirely unknown to science." We are prepared to show that this assertion is entirely at variance with the facts. And, although he attempts to perpetrate a witticism relative to "grocers" and "trunk-makers," still this has no bearing on the matter. We would ask Dr. Holmes to point out names more celebrated than Hippocrates, Boerhaave, Haller, Hoffmann, Willis, Stoerck, De Haen, Sydenham, Percival, Stahl, Thomson, Cleghorn, Huxham, Pringle, Hunter, Cullen, Hufeland, and a host of others whom Hahnemann has cited to prove that sensible traces of homœopathy existed in every epoch of the medical art. If these names are not celebrated in medicine, what names are? We suppose the Doctor would point to the author of the last made text book as a shining light. The ingratitude of Republics is proverbial, but we think the ingratitude of Doctors will hereafter become quite as familiar an adage. That the name of Hunter, the immortal surgeon, of Sydenham, and of Haller, should be coupled with allusions to "trunk-makers" and "grocers" by one of the respectable fraternity of "Sawbones!" Is it, after this, to be wondered at, that Le Sage and Moliere have poured their vials of sarcasm on the profession? Dr. Holmes states, "it is probably wholly impossible on this side of the Atlantic, and even in most of the public libraries of Europe, to find anything more than a small fraction of the innumerable publications," &c. We would inquire if it is impossible to procure the writings of the eminent men whose names we have given above. Dr. Holmes's knowledge of medical

literature must be circumscribed indeed, if he knows not of the works of Hunter or Cullen, of Sydenham, of Boerhaave. &c. Why did he not consult some of these authors, and from their pages make the falsity of Hahnemann manifest to his readers, if he has really exhibited any? Could he not procure the Edinburgh Commentaries, or the Philosophical Transactions? All of these Hahnemann cites. But he contents himself with referring to Cœlius Aurelianus, an ancient author, written in Latin, and to which but few of his readers could have access. He endeavors to make it appear that Hahnemann has misquoted this author. Such is not the fact. Hahnemann says, on page 73, of the fourth edition of his Organon, “Schon Asclepiades heilte eine Hirn-Entzündung mit einer Kleiner Gabe Wein.” That is, Even Asclepiades cured inflammation of the brain with a small quantity of wine. Now if Dr. Holmes was looking for one case in particular, in which Asclepiades used wine successfully in this disease, he was in search of something which Hahnemann had given him no reason to believe he would be able to discover. Asclepiades was an old Greek physician, who flourished about seventy years before the birth of Christ. Cœlius Aurelianus, in the chapter referred to by Hahnemann, criticises Asclepiades’s mode of treating this disease, and the chapter is thus headed, *Item ad Asclepiadem phreniticos curantem*. This whole chapter is devoted to a review of Asclepiades’s *mode of curing* inflammation of the brain, and in which the use of wine is a prominent feature. Cœlius Aurelianus himself condemns the method, and it is not a little curious that in his remarks he approaches closely to homœopathy. On page 57 he says, “quippe cum Asclepiades ex vino frequenter phreneticos fieri fateatur, atque similes ebriis inveniri; quonam modo igitur credi potest eosdem multo vino accepto, atque meraco relevari, quibus alienatio ex vino, facta perspicitur? quæ necessario in capite simili semper vexatione operatur.” Hahnemann did not cite Cœlius Aurelianus, but Asclepiades through the criticism of that author;

and all that he states is fully borne out. Which are we now to impugn, the candor or the research of Hahnemann's critic? We leave our readers to decide.

Is it not self-evident that a criticism which is upheld by means so disingenuous must be invidious? So far from militating against homœopathy, it must, in unbiased minds, redound to its advantage; for it shows that, in order to make it *appear* false, it is necessary to deny historical facts, and to assert that by far the majority of names the most celebrated in every epoch of medicine are "wholly unknown to science;" a statement which we have shown to be wholly at variance with the facts.

In corroboration of the homœopathic law, "like cures like," Hahnemann has adduced a number of familiar examples showing that this method has been successfully adopted in domestic practice without any knowledge however of the principle involved by those applying it. He thus mentions the treatment of frozen limbs by the application of snow and frozen sour crout, and the treatment of burns by holding the burnt part to the fire.* Touching these points, Dr. H. says, "There are a few familiar facts of which great use has been made as an entering wedge for the homœopathic doctrine. They have been suffered to pass current so long that it is time they should be nailed to the counter, a little operation which I undertake with perfect cheerfulness to perform for them."

An amiable trait in our critic's character is his entire self-complacency, and the cheerfulness with which he performs "*little operations*." With what success we shall endeavor to point out. He tells us that it is by preventing the too rapid application of heat that snow or ice water restores vitality to a frozen limb, and afterwards remarks, "Now the treatment of a frozen limb by heat in large or small quantities, is not homœopathy." It will be perceived

* Although Hahnemann mentions this mode of treating burns, he by no means gives it the preference to all others. It is merely given as a familiar instance of the homœopathic law.

that he falls into the not uncommon error of confounding his rationale with the fact. We however do not think his explanation a rational one. Pernio, or chilblain, is likewise cured by the application of snow or ice water, and here there is absolutely more heat than natural, as is manifested by the smarting and burning. We maintain that the application of snow and frozen sour crout to frozen limbs, proves serviceable, because they are *exactly adapted to the excitability of the part*, and the application of these, so far from acting as a preventive of heat, is really the cause of a generation of heat, from the fact of their adaptation on the score of excitability. Cold acts like a stimulant to the frozen part, rouses the benumbed energies of the vital principle, produces *reaction*, and with it the vital warmth. It will thus be seen that cold applications absolutely develop heat. We may make this still plainer from the fact that individuals in a state of congelation are not "generally brought into a warm room," as stated by Dr. H. This would be exceedingly bad practice, and would almost inevitably produce destruction of the frozen parts. It is essential, however, to the Doctor's theory, that the snow proves curative by preventing the too rapid application of heat. Now it is a well known fact that individuals in a state of congelation are carried to a cold out-house, where the temperature scarcely differs from that of the open air. The cold snow, or frozen sour crout is applied, and when this has produced reaction, and with it some returning warmth, it first becomes at all safe to convey the patient to a room, the temperature of which is exalted somewhat above that of the out-door atmosphere.

In reference to the treatment of burns by holding the burnt part to the fire, the principle of adaptation to the excitability of the part is likewise explanatory. The celebrated surgeon, John Hunter, in his work on the blood, mentions the great inconvenience that results from applying cold water to burns, and prefers the method of exposing the burnt part to the fire. Besides this, there are various

other modes of curing burns, which we think even Dr. H. will admit are homœopathic. We allude to the application of turpentine, hot alcohol, raw cotton, &c., which every one knows prove extremely efficacious, and it is just as well known that turpentine and hot alcohol excite burning and smarting when applied to the healthy skin, and raw cotton evidently retains heat by preventing evaporation. Now, if the principle of purging a man who is constipated be true, then it is right to apply *cold water to burns*, which is now well known to be productive of much mischief.

Dr. H. next comes to speak again of vaccination. He says, "A third instance in proof of the homœopathic law is sought for in the acknowledged efficacy of vaccination. And how does the law apply to this? It is granted by the advocates of homœopathy, that there is a resemblance between the effects of the vaccine virus on a person in health and the symptoms of small pox. Therefore, according to the rule, the vaccine virus will cure small pox, which, as every body knows, is entirely untrue." Now, if Dr. H. considers the Allopathists, with himself, as "every body," we acknowledge there may be some truth in what he states; but as to ourselves, we beg leave to state that we have seen cases of true small pox *cured* by the vaccine virus, prepared homœopathically, and administered internally. In this we do not stand alone, for the homœopathic profession are almost unanimous in regard to the applicability of vaccinia in true variola. There is another fact, however, which entirely overturns Dr. H's. chain of reasoning upon this subject. There is another contagious disease which reigns epidemically, and proves almost as destructive to childhood as small pox to adults. We refer to *scarlet fever*. The labors of Hahnemann have shown that *belladonna*, when properly administered, during the prevalence of an epidemic scarlet fever, prevents contagion. The truth of this observation has been admitted by many Allopathists of high authority, *who have tested the matter practically*. Dr. Dunglison says, in reference to the prophylactic powers of

belladonna, " We have thought it advisable for the last few years to endeavor to test the prophylactic virtues of *belladonna*, during the prevalence of epidemic scarlatina. Whether the article exhibited had any preventive agency, it is not easy to determine. All we can say is, that the children to whom it was exhibited did not contract the disease." Dr. Thiebaud, in the *Journal of Medicine of La Loire Inferieur*, says, " I conscientiously believe that *belladonna* very truly possesses the virtues which have been attributed to it." This gentleman continues, " The number of children or adults who have taken *belladonna* during more or less violent epidemics, amounts to 2027, and of this number seventy-nine were affected with the disease. They are not unheard of physicians who have lent their names to this prophylactic medication! There are Hufeland and Schenck, who, of five hundred and fifteen subjects subjected to *belladonna*, found three only affected with scarlatina. It has been used with success by Cumper, Berndt, Behr, Veslin, Murbeck, Dusterburg, &c. Dr. Murbeck asserts, that for seven years he has employed, always with equal success, *belladonna* as preservative in scarlet fever. Dr. Dusterburg, of Narburg, has administered *belladonna* with such success, that during three consecutive epidemics of scarlatina, he looked upon this prophylactic remedy to be as efficacious as vaccine matter in small pox. In order to be more certain as to the results, he made one of the most conclusive experiments. He selected in each family submitted to the treatment, one child, to whom *belladonna* was not given. All the children thus excepted were affected by the contagion.

We might go on, did our space permit, and adduce an immense amount of evidence in support of the anti-scarlatinous powers of *belladonna*. We have given the above to show how futile is the argument of Dr. H., when he states that the vaccine virus protects from small pox, because it is a " morbid poison," and multiplies itself, " as a seed does in the soil." Now, *belladonna* is *not* a morbid poison, and

does *not* multiply itself as a seed does in the soil, and yet we perceive that it is a preservative from a very fatal contagious disease, which, like small pox, appears in an epidemic form. This proves, that in order to act as a prophylactic in certain contagious epidemics, it is not essential that the substance used should be a morbid poison. It is perfectly philosophical to inquire, What first led Hahnemann to administer belladonna as a prophylactic in scarlatina? We answer, the resemblance between the symptoms *it produces on the healthy and those of the disease*. Homœopathy is the only system by which we can ever hope to extend the number of these prophylactics to other contagious diseases which appear in an epidemic form, because it is the only system which ascertains the true effects of medical agents with which we prevent and cure diseases.

The course of the Homœopathic Examiner, in reference to comparisons of bills of mortality of cholera patients treated homœopathically and allopathically, appears to excite the ire of our author. We never knew it otherwise! Speak to an Allopathist of cholera, and he foams at the mouth! The reason is obvious; cholera was a *new disease* in an epidemic form. The dominant medical practice was notoriously unsuccessful in its treatment. In the first place physicians knew not the true effects of medical agents wherewith to modify the various morbid phenomena which presented themselves. Secondly, the majority of them were attached to the principles of nosology, and in accordance with its dictates deemed it all essential to give the disease a local habitation. Thus some physicians looked upon it as consequent upon derangement of the liver; others said it depended on the stomach and bowels; a third set contended that it was a deficiency of serum in the blood; and another party was just as positive that it depended upon depressed vitality.

The first of these, the liver doctors, gave calomel and mercurials. The second set, purgatives and emetics. The third injected a saline fluid into the veins, and the fourth employed stimulants, as cayenne pepper. It is therefore no

exaggeration to state that cholera patients, treated allopathically, were literally *peppered and salted*. Probably our views may be considered biased. We therefore subjoin the sentiments of an enlightened allopathist* on this very subject. "Upon these points, and bearing in mind that we have now in medicine the recorded practice of more than two thousand years; — let the reader refer to the proceedings of the medical profession during the prevalence of the so-called 'Asiatic cholera,' and he will find their history everywhere exhibiting an extraordinary picture of prefatory panic, vulgar wonder, doubt, ignorance, obtrusive vanity, plans for profit and popularity, fatal blunders, distracting contradictions, and egregious empiricisms." If this picture can be relied upon, and it is sketched by a master hand, we think it presents a pretty plain statement of the entire nullity of the allopathic treatment of cholera. And so it ever will be, if physicians continue to seek after abstract essences and causes, instead of making use of the five senses with which God has endowed them. Causes, or abstract essences of disease, are not to be sought after; morbid phenomena as manifested by *symptoms* are to be treated as they arise. The physician who adopts this method can never be taken aback even by an epidemic. And this was one reason why homœopathists were so much more successful than their opponents in the treatment of cholera. Another reason was, however, their superior knowledge of the effects of medical agents. We have already repeatedly shown that our author has looked upon all things pertaining to Homœopathy, with a *jaundiced* eye. We have shown his disingenuousness in reference to Hahnemann's *Materia Medica*, in regard to Andral's statements, and the authorities which Hahnemann quotes to prove that the fundamental principle of his doctrine could be traced through all epochs of the medical art, &c. We are therefore not surprised to see that he takes up two cases of *jaundice*,

* Dr. James Rush, of Philadelphia.

which, according to a homœopathic journal, required the one twenty-nine, and the other thirty-four days to effect a cure. While he informs his audience that *he* cured a case in ten days. This is all very fair, to be sure, for jaundice is jaundice, and of course there could be no such thing as any difference in the violence of the cases! They were all just alike, beyond doubt, as he has given us no particulars with regard to either of them. Under these circumstances we must be permitted to add, that this looks very much like the *tender of a professional card* to his audience.

Dr. Holmes, not content with having put down Homœopathy, by recounting the experiments of M. Andral, the merits of which we have clearly shown, adduces those of Dr. Baille, in the following manner: "Dr. Baille, one of the physicians in the great Hotel Dieu of Paris, invited two homœopathic practitioners to experiment in his wards; one of these, *Curie*, now of London, whose works are on the counters of some of our bookstores, and probably in the hands of some of my audience. This gentleman, whom Dr. Baille declares to be an enlightened man and perfectly sincere in his convictions, brought his own medicines from the pharmacy which furnished Hahnemann himself, and he employed them for four or five months upon patients in his wards and with results equally unsatisfactory, as appears from Dr. Baille's statement at a meeting of the Academy of Medicine." Dr. Holmes has exhibited here the same want of candor with which we charged him when commenting on Andral's so termed "*experiments.*" He does not mention the fact that these statements have been fully met by a reply from Dr. Curie, one of the physicians engaged in these very experiments, and to whom allusion is made by Dr. Baille. We, however, are anxious that our readers should hear both sides, and judge for themselves. We, therefore, give Dr. Curie's statement in reply to Dr. Baille.

"Dr. Baille declared that he had, for five months, confided several of the patients in one of his wards in the Hospital

(L'Hôtel Dieu) to the care of two of the most fervent disciples of Hahnemann, and that, under their management, no cures, with the exception of two, had, by such means, been effected.

“The other physician, Dr. Andral, declared that he had made a great number of experiments to demonstrate the action of the infinitesimal doses, both on persons in health and on patients, but had never been able to discover that they produced the slightest effect.

“It is indeed true, that Dr. Bailly allowed two homœopathic physicians to treat certain sick persons in the Hôtel Dieu ; but it is also true, that the greater part of the cases put under their care were decidedly *incurable*. Dr. Bailly was, at that time, engaged in experiments with kreosote, and, in his quality of member of the academic commission, was trying its effect upon a great number of the patients under his care : this might be the reason why he could not furnish these gentlemen with the curable patients he had promised them. They, however, accepted such patients as he was pleased to assign them, but declared, at the same time, that almost all of them were incurable.

“The homœopathists accepted these cases ; first, because they considered it an advantage to be allowed to appear in so great a medical theatre ; secondly, because they were persuaded that, in the end, they should receive curable cases ; and thirdly, because, in their honest zeal for homœopathy, they were resolved to encounter any difficulties, however great ; for, being themselves sure of the truth of their doctrines, they were satisfied that, sooner or later, they should convince the most incredulous. Such were their motives.

“It is, moreover, a fact, that Dr. Simon and I (who were the physicians entrusted with these cases) addressed a letter to M. Bailly, on the 6th of January, 1834, when about a month had elapsed, after the cases were given us, in which we declared our intention to withdraw from the Hôtel Dieu, if cases impartially selected were not assigned

to us. By referring to that journal, however, the reader will be satisfied that *none but chronic and generally incurable cases were allowed us*, and that *we were likewise deprived of every facility in the treatment of them*.

“Dr. Bailly, however, has omitted to state, which he might and probably would have done, had not his private register been *lost*, that the condition of several of the *incurable* patients was ameliorated by our treatment, and that the few curable ones were actually cured !

“Amongst the cases alluded to were several which I shall here notice ; namely, three cases of chronic catarrh of the chest, one of chronic affection of the liver, attended with hemorrhoids, and one of excessive emaciation, produced by lead-colic. A *perfect cure* was effected on a patient who had an inflammatory tumor on the thigh ; upon another who had intermittent fever, and that too after a third relapse, under the allopathic treatment ; and on a third, who, having lost the power of speech by an attack of apoplexy, had his voice restored.

“These cases are not mentioned in Dr. Bailly’s report, owing probably to the *loss* of his register ; but he there acknowledges the cure of two other cases, although the manner in which they are reported shews it more difficult to *refute* than to *ridicule* homœopathy.

“In one of them, he says, the patient returned to the Hôtel Dieu, three weeks after his discharge, and died there in the course of a few days.

The other patient, he admits, left the hospital perfectly cured ; but he says, that it required more than two months of homœopathic treatment to effect it, whilst another patient, affected with the same malady, was cured in a few weeks by the usual practice.

“To be correct in the last instance, Dr. Bailly should have said, that the case under his own care was that of a patient suffering from typhus fever, unattended by any alarming symptom ; whilst the patient under the care of the homœopaths was under a state of intense delirium, which

rendered it necessary to put him under restraint. He ought also to have added, that, in the latter, fever was accompanied with inflammation of the lungs, and bloody and purulent expectoration ; and that the unfortunate individual had a severe relapse during his convalescence, in consequence of being incautiously permitted to use food directly opposed to the advice of his homœopathic attendants.

“ In regard to the first-mentioned case, some explanation is necessary. It was one of destruction of the uterus by cancer, and of suppuration of the lungs, to which was superadded a mercurial disease, caused by strong injections of corrosive sublimate. The mercurial disease was completely cured by the homœopathists, but the others were, from the commencement, declared by them to be incurable, and it was to these last-mentioned diseases that the patient fell a victim, after her return to the Hôtel Dieu.

“ I have mentioned the *loss* of Dr. Bailly’s private register or note-book. That register contained a complete description of the diseases with which this patient was affected, the treatment which was followed, and the changes which were remarked. We requested Dr. Bailly to give us the register, or at all events a *copy* of the observations there inserted, with the intention of laying them before the public, in order that they might judge whether these experiments, incomplete as they undoubtedly were, and made under very unfavorable circumstances, proved anything in the slightest degree unfavorable to homœopathy. Dr. Bailly’s reply to us was, that the *register had been mislaid*.

“ We leave the reader to draw his own conclusions from this fact ; the accident was certainly an *ungenerous* one ; and we have only to add, that this unfortunate and ill-timed *loss* deprives us of the only indisputable evidence it was in our power to offer to the public (for it was the evidence of our opponents*) that the experiments in Paris, even though

* Printed in the “ Archives et Journal de la Médecine Homœopathique. Tome Troisième.” No. XII. for July, 1835.

unfairly chosen, did by no means wholly fail, as has been unjustly asserted."

Dr. Herring, the distinguished homœopathist of Philadelphia, makes use of the following language respecting Hahnemann's *theories*, in his prefatory remarks to the American edition of the *Organon*, published in Philadelphia, in 1836.

"Hahnemann has appended certain theories to the laws of nature, discovered by him, by which these laws are illustrated and brought into unison with other laws acknowledged, or with other theories received as true. This has never been reckoned a subject of reproach to any discoverer. Man will and must seek to illustrate the phenomena which he observes, and bring individual parts into coaptation—the new into harmony with that previously known. In this endeavor, not only is he liable, but actually does err in the great majority of cases ; accordingly, few hypotheses and attempts at explanation have endured long, and it is a fact of daily acknowledgment, that one hypothesis gives place to another in all sciences. Columbus himself entertained numerous conjectures which time has verified or overthrown. Whether the *theories* of Hahnemann are destined to endure a longer or a shorter space, whether they be the best or not, time only can determine ; be it as it may, however, *it is a matter of minor importance*. For myself, I am generally considered a disciple of Hahnemann, and I do indeed declare, that I am one among the most enthusiastic in doing homage to his greatness ; but nevertheless, I declare also, that since my first acquaintance with homœopathy, (in the year 1821,) down to the present day, I have never yet accepted a single theory in the *Organon* as there promulgated. I feel no aversion to acknowledge this, even to the venerable sage himself. It is the genuine Hahnemannian spirit totally to disregard all theories, even those of one's own fabrication, when they are in opposition to the results of pure experience. All theories and hypotheses have no positive weight whatever, only so far as they lead to new experiments, and afford a better survey of the results of those already made."

“Whoever, therefore, will assail the theories of Hahnemann, or even altogether reject them, is at perfect liberty to do so ; but let him not imagine that he has thereby accomplished a memorable achievement. In every respect it is ‘an affair of little importance.’”

It may be seen, by this extract, that homœopathists are divided with regard to Hahnemann’s theories ; but still, upon the only legitimate subject of argument, the fundamental principle of his doctrine and the trials of remedies on the healthy, they are unanimous. The attempt of Dr. Holmes to bring disrepute upon homœopathy by showing that its practitioners differ upon minor points, upon theories, falls harmlessly to the ground ; for, according to his own evidence, homœopathists have been the first to announce publicly their disbelief with regard to some of these, and among others, Hahnemann’s *Psoric* doctrine. We have already shown that this is approved of by many, but it is a matter which can only be settled by time, which will prove its truth or fallacy. At present it does not at all influence practical homœopathy, and this difference of opinion among homœopathists serves to show that they do not follow Hahnemann with blind zeal ; they *all* believe in the natural curative law which he has discovered, and this they consider as immutable as the laws of electricity, galvanism, or gravitation ; their honest differences of opinion only evince the respect they entertain for the truly Hahnemannian axiom which has been the ruling principle of his life. “Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.”

The next question in order, is with respect to homœopathic literature, which the Homœopathic Examiner asserts to consist of seven hundred volumes. Dr. Holmes says, in regard to this, “If my assertions were proper evidence, I should declare that, having seen a good many of their publications from the year 1834, when I bought the work of the Rev. Thomas Everest, to within the last few weeks, when I received my last importation of homœopathic literature, I have found that all, with very few exceptions, were stitched

12 HOMŒOPATHY.
pamphlets, varying in from twenty to thirty pages, or somewhat less than a hundred, and generally resembling each other as much as so many spelling books."

We think we have abundantly shown that the "assertions" of the Doctor respecting homœopathy are not "proper evidence." We are therefore unwilling to receive them unsupported by proof. It will be perceived that he asserts homœopathic literature, with *very few exceptions*, to consist of stitched pamphlets, containing but a few pages. We are not surprised *now* at the Doctor's ignorance of the subject, if his homœopathic reading has been confined to a few pamphlets. He has not even entered upon the threshold of the science. He is as little qualified to judge of its merits or demerits, if *we believe his own assertions*, as Andral was, according to *his* assertions, to experiment justly. Now our own library, which is by no means complete, contains more than *one hundred volumes* octavo, averaging 500 pages each, exclusively devoted to homœopathic science. These are works the most essentially practical, and we consider our library far from complete, even in this particular. We have not the slightest doubt that seven hundred volumes is rather an under than over estimate of the number of published works, exclusively devoted to this subject. If our evidence is valid, having *these books in our possession*, then it will be perceived how little credence is to be given to Dr. H. and his "stitched pamphlets." Do not our readers think that other folks beside the Doctor have the right to try their hands at nailing spurious coin to the counter?

Dr. Holmes next adduces a passage from Dr. Trinks, a homœopathist, whose assertions only tend to prove that there has been much homœopathic literature published which is decidedly bad. This every one who is candid will admit, and the reason is quite natural; it is scarce once in a cycle, that we meet with a *medical truth*, they are not as plenty as thorns in a hedge, but men will let off a little superfluous steam in the form of a book, whether homœopathist or allopathist; the evidence of Trinks has bearing solely

on this fact, and not as to the *number of volumes* published upon the subject, and as evidence on this point, is therefore entirely irrelevant: but as the Doctor has taken up the cudgels, we will humor him, and show him the lamentable deficiencies of his own school, even in this particular. Thus Dr. Rush says, "It seems to be one of the rules of faith in our art, that every truth must be helped into belief by some persuasive fiction of the school. And I here owe it to the general reader to confess that as far as I know, the medical profession can scarcely produce a single volume in its practical department, from the works of Hippocrates down to the last made text book, which by the requisitions of an exact philosophy, will not be found to *contain nearly as much fiction as truth.*" And again, Menzel, who though not a physician, is nevertheless a *philosopher*, says, "The science of medicine enjoys an immeasurable literature, which unhappily has not been collected into a Bible. It numbers creeds and sects enough; and as theological parties finally come together in faith, medical parties unite at the most in unbelief. Nowhere does so much confusion and contradiction prevail among opposite parties — nowhere so much uncertainty in every party." These views we submit to our readers as the views of an enlightened and philosophic practitioner of the old school, and of a philosopher whose sole aim is by just criticism to improve every branch of human knowledge.

Another point in the lectures of Dr. Holmes, which might exert an influence upon some minds, is the statements in regard to the demise of the homœopathic journals established at Paris. Philosophically considered, this should not have the least weight, for medical, as well as literary journals are constantly springing up and going down everywhere. So much depends upon the tact and talent of the conductor, that it would be a fallacy to attempt to found an argument respecting the truth of any particular doctrine, or even respecting its popularity, upon a basis so ephemeral. Are not the medical journals of this country going down con-

stantly? We know of a number in Philadelphia, which lived a sickly life, a sort of journalised asphyxia, until finally the vital spark became extinct indeed, that is, *they went down*. Now when our author tells us that such a homœopathic journal had so many subscribers this year, and not so many the next, it proves nothing more than the mere fact with regard to that one journal. He must be a soap bubble philosopher indeed, who looks solely to such evidences. We could mention a number of allopathic journals that have died throughout the country. Are we thereby justified in concluding that the old practice is on the decline in this country? In regard to the publications of homœopathic works by the Messrs. Bailliers, of Paris, we have only to state that within the last two months we received from these gentlemen a catalogue of homœopathic works which number over fifty, apart from several new works since published, and likewise an annunciation of several others which are at *this time* either just published or in the press.

One of these, a work on nervous diseases, will soon, probably, be in the hands of some of our readers, as we learn it is the intention of our talented friend, Dr. Kitchen, of Philadelphia, to translate it as soon as it is received in this country.

Now what Monsieur Louis told to the veracious correspondent of the Doctor has little or no bearing upon the point at issue, for we have already shown, through Menzel, that hierarchies, even in theology, look upon reformers as heretics. We are, therefore, not surprised when Louis says "that no person of distinction, in Paris, had embraced Homœopathy," for the moment a man embraced Homœopathy, he would no longer be considered a man of distinction by Louis. Men are men of distinction, or otherwise, according to circumstances. Thus, the characters of Washington, Jefferson, Hancock, and a host of our revolutionary patriots were developed by the peculiar circumstances of the times. Although we may occasionally meet with an exception, yet as a general truth, eminent medical men pur-

sue the even tenor of their way, content with the honor they have achieved by their own theories. Therefore, such men, if they do look at any new subject, do it cursorily or superficially, prejudging the case, as did Andral.

Dr. Holmes labors hard to make his readers believe that Homœopathy is on the decline in Paris. This is the old story. When Homœopathy was first introduced into this country, its opponents predicted its downfall in less than one year. Notwithstanding their sage prognostics, it still continues to make cures and increase the number of its adherents. It appears from Dr. Holmes's statements, that having seen the name of M. Breschet mentioned in a New York newspaper, as an advocate of Homœopathy, a correspondent of his (the Doctor), addressed M. Breschet, informing him of that fact, to which that learned Professor responded, and his reply Dr. H. gives in full. In it we find the following, "I spurn far from me that charlatanism called Homœopathy." This is all that could be expected from a Professor who has not examined the subject, and is about as well qualified to give an opinion under the circumstances as the late celebrated Black Hawk, the Indian chief, would have been to have pronounced a serious judgment upon Newton's theory of light or some of the late discoveries in electro-magnetism. Our author likewise speaks of Professor Marjolin, who, it appears, was also accused of looking at Homœopathy with a favorable eye. He gives nothing definite from this gentleman, but, what is much to the purpose, informs his readers that he heard him lecture when he was in Paris. He says, "I regret not having made any inquiries as to Marjolin, who, I doubt not, would strike his ponderous snuff box until it resounded like the Grecian horse, at hearing such a doctrine associated with his respectable name." Now we are inclined to think that the worthy Professor will be not a little vexed to hear his "respectable name" coupled with such a noisy "snuff box." On the whole, however, we are willing to join our regrets with the Doctor's at this sad oversight, for having shown that he has got himself in a

quandary with homœopathic statements, we doubt not that Marjolin, or at least his "snuff box" might have proved a valuable auxiliary *on a pinch!* The ire of the dignified Professor and the resonance of his "snuff box" would, together, have proved opposition of such terrific magnitude, that no rash Homœopath would dared to *have sneezed at!*

Admitting, for the sake of argument, (what we deny in fact) that Homœopathy is going down in Paris, still we think the Doctor had better look nearer home for the signs of the times. Homœopathy is not going down in this country, and more particularly in Boston* and its vicinity. We can tell the Doctor, however, a mode by which he can give Homœopathy its death-blow — *prove it false by experimentally testing its fundamental principles.* Otherwise all arguments are thrown away, for, according to his own statements, the very men whom his correspondent consulted were its opponents, and they were men, too, of that class whom we have shown, from the world's history, always to be opposed to anything which savors of reformation.

Dr. Holmes objects strongly that Homœopathists should refer to the honored names of Harvey and Jenner to show that opposition to new medical discoveries which time has subsequently proved to be true, is common in the profession. He attempts to show that Harvey did not meet with great opposition, and seems to think that Homœopathy must be false because the facts of Harvey and Jenner's discoveries were pretty generally admitted within a less time than has elapsed since the discovery of Homœopathy. He should recollect, however, the vast difference between the discoveries. Harvey's was nothing more than the demonstration of a new physiological fact — that the blood circulated. Jenner demonstrated the prophylactic

* We might have included Philadelphia, for a practitioner of that city, who has every opportunity of knowing, informs us that more than *five hundred* patients are there prescribed for, daily, by Homœopathists.

powers of a morbid poison. These were comparatively circumscribed. The discovery of Hahnemann covers a far wider field. It contemplates a thorough reform in *Materia Medica* and *Therapeutics*. The admirable manner in which one truth corroborates another is exemplified in the beautiful solution Homœopathy affords of the efficacy of vaccination.

We have now followed our author through every topic of importance on which he touches that has the least bearing upon Homœopathy ; there are some little *et ceteras* which we have not wasted time upon. Minor points, which he has handled “with all the rash dexterity of wit,” which in reality are entirely irrelevant. Bulwer, we think it is, who says that certain crimes appear to be epidemic ; he might have extended his remarks to other circumstances in human conduct besides crime. Every epoch is distinguished by some peculiar trait, and there is none to which humanity has a more decided predilection than prophesy. The present time is honored by a number of these dippers into futurity, *par courtesie Prophets*. Thus, we have had our Matthias, the veritable Joe Smith, Miller, and a host of foretellers of the speedy approach of the Millennial Epoch ! It does not surprise us, then, that one of the medical fraternity, a profession always celebrated for the ambition of its adherents, fired by the fame acquired by the illustrious names we have cited, should appear before the world in the garb of a prophet. And accordingly, on the last page of his book we find our critic assuming the mantle of Matthias, dabbling in futurity, and telling what is to be—or not to be, with Homœopathy. But having shown how lamentably he has failed in accurately noting what has *already come to pass*, we shall not follow him into the mystic depths of the future ; but now take our leave of him, feeling confident that truth, “like the infinitely wise and gracious God, is eternal. Men may disregard it for a time, until the period arrives, when its rays, according to the deter-

mination of Heaven, shall irresistibly break through the mists of prejudice, and like Aurora and the opening day, shed a beneficent light, clear and unextinguishable over the generations of men.”¹

¹ Hahnemann.